APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,904	08/14/2006	Amr Yassin	US020570	6587

24737   7590   09/05/2007

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/539,904	YASSIN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jeong S. Park	2154	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 August 2006*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 August 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/16/2005*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1-12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 6, the phrase "said robotic web browser" should be corrected as –

said multi-dimensional robotic web browser-- for clear understanding of the claim.

Similar correction should be made for claims 2-12;

In claim 2, line 6, the phrase "at least a portion of" should be corrected as –said

at least a portion of-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be

made for claim 3, line 5;

In claim 3, line 5, the phrase "said local high level program instructions" should

be corrected as –local high level program instructions-- for clear understanding of the

claim;

In claim 7, line 5, the phrase "said program instructions" should be corrected as –

said high level program instructions-- for clear understanding of the claim;

In claim 8, line 2, the phrase "one or a wireless or wired network" should be

corrected as –one of a wireless or wired network-- for clear understanding of the claim;

In claim 9, lines 2 and 12 the phrase "said instructions" should be corrected as –

said high level language instructions-- for clear understanding of the claim; and

In claim 10, line 5 the phrase "said stored instructions" should be corrected as –

said stored high level language instructions-- for clear understanding of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Zweig (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,325 B2).

Regarding claim 1, Zweig teaches as follows:

a multi-dimensional robotic web browser (computerized mobile robot with an

onboard Internet web server, see, e.g., abstract, lines 1-7), comprising:

means for downloading high level program instructions transmitted over

an electronic network (the robot receives its most general highest level commands from

the remote Internet link, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67); and

means for rendering said downloaded high level program instructions (control

instructions) transmitted over said electronic network (Internet)(interpreter program,

RCS software 16 in figure 2, interprets and compiles various control instructions, see,

e.g., col. 10, lines 10-12), such that when at least a portion of said downloaded

instructions are rendered (interpret and modify these top-level commands in a quick and

real-time manner, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-6), direct said robotic web browser to one of

move in three dimensions, play back an audio stream, or play back a video stream (a

robot may be given a remote command over the Internet to move forward a number of feet, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 7-8).

Zweig teaches all the limitations of claim except for designing the robot as a web server instead of a web browser.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for storing said downloaded high level program instructions (CGI commands are passed through CGI interface to other program in the robot's onboard memory, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 28-36); and

means for retrieving said downloaded high level program instructions (CGI commands) from said storing means (robot's onboard memory)(run these other program passed from CGI commands as needed, see, e.g., col. 10 ,lines 28-36).

Regarding claim 3, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for rendering pre-stored high level program instructions (processed instructions or previously assigned set of commands) pre-stored on one or more computer-readable media (robot's onboard memory) coupled to or integrated with said robotic web browser (standing orders are to modify the state of the robot without requesting further input from remote internet site, the robot activates a previously assigned set of commands to move out of the area, see, e.g., col. 11, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 4, Zweig teaches as follows:

a mobile robot (functioning as a web server) sends Hyper Text Markup Language files using the HTTP protocol on telecommunications link to a web browser running on remote Internet site (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 36-39); and

a user on web browser sends CGI data to the CGI interface of the robot's onboard web server (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 39-42).

Since Zweig teaches using a robot as a web server instead of web browser, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Regarding claim 5, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for processing data in two-dimensions (displaying video) in accordance with current and future network browser standards (it is inherent functionality for any existing web browser, Java applets can translate user commands to other languages ,display video, display interactive graphics and other useful functions, see, e.g., col. 2 , lines 43-50).

Regarding claims 6 and 11, Zweig teaches as follows:

said electronic network is the Internet (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 7, Zweig teaches as follows:

said program instructions are downloaded in accordance with a recognized

Internet transmission protocol (HTTP and TCP/IP, see, e.g., col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line

4).

Regarding claims 8 and 12, Zweig teaches as follows:

said electronic network is one of a wireless or wired network (Internet could be

wireless or wired network, see, e.g., see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 9, Zweig teaches as follows:

a system for executing high level language instructions (highest level

commands), downloaded over an electronic network (Internet link)(see, e.g., col. 6, line

65 to col. 7, line 6), said instructions for processing in a multi-dimensional

robotic web browser (see, e.g., col. 7, line 7-8), the system comprising:

at least one remote computer (remote Internet user, 4 in figure 1) for generating

said high level language instructions (the remote Internet user sends back CGI

commands requesting robotic movement back to server, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 50-56);

said electronic network (telecommunications link, 3 in figure 1) coupling said at

least one remote computer (remote Internet user, 4 in figure 1) with said multi-

dimensional robotic web browser (mobile robot, 1 in figure 1)(see, e.g., col. 9, lines 34-

39);

said multi-dimensional robotic web browser (computerized mobile robot with an

onboard Internet web server, see, e.g., abstract, lines 1-7), comprising:

means for receiving said high level language instructions downloaded over said

electronic network (the robot receives its most general highest level commands from the

remote Internet link, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67); and

means for rendering said downloaded high level language instructions (control instructions), such that when at least a portion of said instructions are rendered by said robotic web browser (interpret and modify these top-level commands in a quick and real-time manner, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-6), direct said robotic web browser to one of move in three-dimensions, playback an audio stream, playback a video stream (a robot may be given a remote command over the Internet to move forward a number of feet, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 7-8).

Zweig teaches all the limitations of claim except for designing the robot as a web server instead of a web browser.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is 571-270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP

August 24, 2007

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER